

Government Organization

three parts and split up their functions does not fulfil the responsibilities of a Prime Minister in this age of advanced automation.

Furthermore, I cannot help but think that a great deal of the problem which has faced us in parliament has stemmed from the organization of the business of the House of Commons. If we as members are given a bill of fare which has been carefully thought out before being presented to us we can do an effective job. Without a carefully thought-out program, to change the rules is futile, and it is also futile to reorganize the departments of government. What we in parliament need more than anything else is leadership from the government benches, leadership that will improve and protect the image of parliament, that will improve the effectiveness of this institution and provide us with proposals into which we can really sink our teeth and come up with something worthwhile for the Canadian people.

The Canada Development Corporation proposal has been before the cabinet for many months. Perhaps it will eventually be introduced here again but in a revised form. In this connection one can think of the Canada Pension plan and other pieces of legislation that were revised, revised and revised before parliament was able to deal with them, with the result that much time was lost. The image of this institution was destroyed and in the interval the enthusiasm of members was lessened.

The hon. member who preceded me referred to the committee structure of the house and said that committee decisions are ignored by the government. This is a fertile field for the reorganization of the business of the house. Committees should be given something worthwhile to do. Members who serve on them should know that their decisions will be acted upon. Committees can take some of the pressure off this chamber and even off cabinet ministers.

Ministers who have been unable to cope with the problems of long-established departments will, I feel, have the same difficulty with the proposed new departments. I take a very dim view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture is going to be split in three, because when we ask questions on agricultural matters in the house one minister will be able to slough them off on another and no one will give us answers. I also take a dim view of the fact that the Department of Labour is being mutilated.

[Mr. Nasserden.]

One serious omission from the proposed reorganization is a proposal to establish a department of urban affairs. Now that Canada is emerging as an industrial nation, urban problems are becoming greater and greater. All across the country people are leaving agricultural employment, going to the cities to look for jobs and trying to become part of new communities. This is a problem that has been increasing for several years but we in the Canadian parliament in 1966 are failing utterly to do anything about the problems of these people not only in metropolitan areas such as Toronto and Montreal but in smaller communities.

Another problem with which we are faced is the multiplicity of parties in this house. I do not know whether the Prime Minister thought last fall that he could do something about that when he called the election or whether he thought he would be able to reorganize the government as a result of the election, but as I look at this legislation I cannot help but think it is an exercise in futility, and unless we get the leadership we need from the treasury benches parliament cannot help but continue to cast the poor image across the country that it casts today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you have allowed three members of the opposition to speak and I think it is time a member on this side of the house had the opportunity to participate in the debate. I do not care if you are following a list, sir, but I know there is no list so far as this side is concerned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Does the hon. member wish to speak?

Mr. Macaluso: I stood up twice for that purpose.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): I regret I did not see the hon. member. I hope he will accept my apologies. I recognized the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi but the hon. member will have his turn in due course.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and with all due deference to you, I think it has been the rule to proceed in a circuit around the house in calling on members to speak.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order. The hon. member's point of order was well put and I think he has enlightened the Chair,